

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

ERIC DOMAIN GLOVER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

J. MOSLEY, Corporal, Allendale  
Correctional Institution; MICHAEL  
MOORE, Director, South Carolina  
Department of Corrections;  
GERALDINE MIRO, Warden of

No. 99-7595

Allendale Correctional Institution;  
MCKITHER BODISON, Associate  
Warden, Allendale Correctional  
Institution; RICHARD MCCANTS,  
Associate Warden, Allendale  
Correctional Institution; BERNARD  
WALKER, Major of Security,  
Allendale Correctional Institution,  
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston.  
Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District Judge.  
(CA-98-3427-2-20AJ)

Submitted: April 25, 2000

Decided: July 21, 2000

Before WIDENER and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges,  
and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

## COUNSEL

Eric Domain Glover, Appellant Pro Se. Marvin Coleman Jones,  
BOGOSLOW & JONES, Walterboro, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See  
Local Rule 36(c).

---

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

Eric Domain Glover appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999) complaint and denying his subsequent motions for reconsideration, to amend the facts, and for a new trial. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion rejecting the magistrate judge's recommendation and find no reversible error.

A prisoner's claim that officials failed to protect him from harm is analyzed as a challenge to the prisoner's conditions of confinement, rather than as an allegation of excessive force. See Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 833 (1994); see also Babcock v. White, 102 F.3d 267, 273 (7th Cir. 1996). Although the district court here incorrectly analyzed Glover's claims under the latter approach, Glover nevertheless failed to show that he suffered a "serious or significant physical or mental injury" as a result of the Defendants' conduct. See Strickler v. Waters, 989 F.2d 1375, 1381 (4th Cir. 1993) (setting standard for analyzing conditions of confinement claims).

Accordingly, we affirm substantially on the reasoning of the district court. See Glover v. Mosley, No. CA-98-3427-2-20AJ (D.S.C. Oct. 5, 1999). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

### AFFIRMED